

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.weylo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,805	02/07/2006	Hironori Tashiro	274011US0PCT	6797
OBLON, SPIX	7590 02/02/200 /AK, MCCLELLAND	EXAM	EXAMINER	
1940 DUKE STREET			MOSS, KERI A	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/02/2009	FLECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

## Interview Summary

(1) KERI A. MOSS, Junior Examiner.

 Application No.
 Applicant(s)

 10/539,805
 TASHIRO ET AL.

 Examiner
 Art Unit

 KERI A. MOSS
 1797

(3)Kirsten Gruneberg, Ph.D. Attorney for Applicant.

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(2) Maureen Wallenhorst, Primary Examiner.  Date of Interview: 27 January 2009.  Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant  Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes if Yes, brief description: ☐ Proposed New claims 4-15.  Identification of prior art discussed: Larson and Melvin.  Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiners Moss and Wallenhorst noted 112, 2 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph issues with the new claims and requested some sort of formula to clarify how the biodegradation rate is determined. With respect to evercominal the prior art. Examiners Moss and Wallenhorst recommended amending the claims to either 1) having "consisting of" in the preamble or 2) adding a negative step that specifies not enriching the samples with C14.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT GIVEN A DNN-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS PROM THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.		
Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]  Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes if Yes, brief description:	(2) Maureen Wallenhorst, Primary Examiner.	(4) Dr. Toshiya Abiko, representative for Assignee.
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) □ applicant 2) ⊠ applicant's representative]  Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) □ Yes if Yes, brief description: □ e) ⊠ No.  If Yes, brief description: □ e) № No.  Claim(s) discussed: Proposed New claims 4-15.  Identification of prior art discussed: Larson and MelVin.  Agreement with respect to the claims f) □ was reached. g) ② was not reached. h) □ N/A.  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiners Moss and Wallenhorst noted 112. 2 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph issues with the new claims and requested some sort of formula to clarify how the biodegradation rate is determined. With respect to evercoming the prior art. Examiners Moss and Wallenhorst recommended amending the claims to either 11 having "consisting of" in the preamble or 2) adding a negative step that specifies not enriching the samples with C14.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT GIVEN ANON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MALLING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM of Interview	Date of Interview: 27 January 2009.	
If Yes, brief description:  Claim(s) discussed: Proposed New claims 4-15.  Identification of prior art discussed: Larson and Melvin.  Agreement with respect to the claims fy was reached. gy was not reached. hy N/A.  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiners Moss and Wallenhorst noted 112, Z** paragraph issues with the new claims and requested some sort of formula to clairfy how the biodegradation rate is determined. With respect to overcoming the prior art. Examiners Moss and Wallenhorst recommended amending the claims to either 1) having "consisting of" in the preemble or 2) adding a negative step that specifies not enriching the samples with C14.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MALLING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER.	Type: a)☐ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference c)☑ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant	2)⊠ applicant's representative]
Identification of prior art discussed: Larson and Melvin.  Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiners Moss and Wallenhorst noted 112, Z** paragraph issues with the new claims and requested some sort of formula to clair's how the biodegradation rate is determined. With respect to overcoming the prior art. Examiners Moss and Wallenhorst recommended amending the claims to either 1) having consisting of in the preamble or 2) adding a negative step that specifies not enriching the samples with C14.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MALLING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER.		e)⊠ No.
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>Examiners Moss and Wallenhorst noted 112, 2<sup>rd</sup> paragraph issues with the new claims and requested some sort of formula to clairf how the biodeogradation rate is determined. With respect to overcoming the prior art, <u>Examiners Moss and Wallenhorst recommended amending the claims to either 1) having consisting of in the preamble or 2) adding a negative step that specifies not enriching the samples with C14.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MALLING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview</u></u>	Claim(s) discussed: <u>Proposed New claims 4-15</u> .	
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>Examiners Moss and Wallenhorst noted 112, Z<sup>rd</sup> paragraph issues with the new claims and requested some sort of formula to clairfy how the biodegradation rate is determined. With respect to overcoming the prior art, <u>Examiners Moss and Wallenhorst recommended amending the claims to either 1) having consisting of in the preamble or 2) adding a negative step that specifies not enriching the samples with C14.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713 04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW CATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER.</u></u>	Identification of prior art discussed: <u>Larson and Melvin</u> .	
reached, or any other comments: Examiners Moss and Wallenhorst noted 112. 2 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph issues with the new claims and requested some sort of formula to clair by how the biodegradation rate is determined. With respect to overcoming the prior art. Examiners Moss and Wallenhorst recommended amendina the claims to either 1) having consisting of in the preamble or 2) adding a negative step that specifies not enriching the samples with C14.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM of Interview	Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached.	g)⊠ was not reached. h)□ N/A.
	reached, or any other comments: Examiners Moss and claims and requested some sort of formula to clair's how overcoming the prior art, Examiners Moss and Wallenhe "consisting of" in the preamble or 2) adding a negative s (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the ame allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where ne allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached. Also, where ne allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached. THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGE INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MULLING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW DATE. OR THE MULLING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW DATE. THE SUBSTANCE OF THES INTERVIEW DATE. THE SUBSTANCE OF THIS INTERVIEW.	Wallenhorst noted 111. 2" paragraph issues with the new y the biodegradation rate is determined. With respect to past recommended amending the claims to either 1) having ten that specifies not enriching the samples with C14. andments which the examiner agreed would render the claims to copy of the amendments that would render the claims hed.)  E ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS ERONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS THERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TC

/Keri A. Moss/

/Maureen M. Wallenhorst/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797